

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M- 23122 of 2019(O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.09.2019

Anil Kumar Jain and othersPetitioners
Versus
State of Punjab ...Respondent
CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Atul Mahajan, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Harpreet Singh Multani, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Suneet Pal Singh Aulakh, Advocate
for the applicant-respondent No.2.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.(Oral)

CRM-28569 of 2019

The instant application has been filed under Section 482
Cr.P.C. for impleadment of Anand Kumar Arora s/o Sh. Ram Ji Dass
Arora as party-respondent No.2.

For the reasons enumerated in the application, the same is
allowed.

Amended memo of parties is taken on record.

Registry to tag the same at appropriate place.

CRM-M-23122 of 2019

Present petition has been filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C.
seeking pre arrest bail in case FIR No. 0078 dated 01.05.2019, under
Sections 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code registered at Police
Station PAU, Ludhiana.

On 20.05.2019 while issuing notice of motion the

following order was passed by this Court:

“Contentends that an amount of ₹ 10 Lakh has already been returned by the petitioners to the complainant on 17.05.2019 and they are willing to clear the remaining balance also.

Notice of motion for 19.07.2019.

In the meanwhile, the petitioners are directed to join the investigation before the Investigating Officer. In the event of their arrest, the Arresting Officer would admit them to interim bail in the present case till the next date of hearing on their furnishing adequate bail and surety bonds to his satisfaction. The petitioners are also directed to abide by all the conditions as envisaged under Section 438(2) Cr.P.C.”

It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that the matter has been settled with the complainant. Further contends that in terms of the above order, petitioners have already joined investigation.

Learned State counsel on instructions from SI Prem Lal has acknowledged the above factual position and stated that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is no longer required in the present case. Even learned counsel for the complainant has also not disputed the factum of compromise.

In view of the above, order dated 20.05.2019 is made absolute subject to the provisions of Section 438(2) Cr. P.C.

Petition stands disposed off.

However, it is made clear that above observations may not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merit of the case pending before learned trial Court.

[MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU]
JUDGE

September 18, 2019

rashmi

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable?

Yes/no
Yes/no